

## REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action mailed on March 7, 2007. The specification and Claims 1 to 12, 14 to 21, 23, 24, 26 to 28, 35 and 36 have been amended. New Claims 37 to 42 have been added. No new matter was added by these amendments or new claims. Claim 13 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

A Petition for One Month Extension of Time and a Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement are submitted herewith. Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for the Extension of Time, Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement and any other fees due in association with this Response.

The Office Action objected to the drawings because they allegedly do not include a reference to "input devices 30." Applicants respectfully disagree with this objection. Fig. 2A includes reference character 30, associated with "INPUT DEVICES." The Office Action appears to focus on the lack of reference character 30 in Figs. 1A and 1B. Page 10, lines 19 to 21 of the description state "[a]s seen in Figs. 1A, 1B and 2A, in one embodiment, the gaming device includes at least one and preferably a *plurality of input devices 30* in communication with the processor (emphasis added)." The specification lists other reference characters illustrated in Figs. 1A and 1B which constitute input devices 30 in various embodiments. For example, "[i]n one embodiment . . . the input device is a game activation device, such a pull arm 32 or a play button 34 . . ." (See Page 10, lines 24 and 25). Applicants respectfully submit that the "plurality of input devices 30" need only be referenced, as done so, in Fig. 2A, as Figs. 1A and 1B identify specific input devices.

The Office Action objected to the drawings because they allegedly include reference characters 208a, 208b, 208c, 208d, 208e and 302 not mentioned in the specification. Applicants respectfully disagree with this objection in part. Applicants refer the Examiner to page 24, line 24 and page 25, line 7 of the specification, where reference characters 208c, 208d and 208e are disclosed. As to the lack of reference characters 208a, 208b and 302, the specification is amended herein to overcome this objection.

The Office Action objected to the specification because of a series of informalities. The specification is amended herein to overcome these objections.

The Office Action advised that should Claim 14 be found allowable, Claim 15 would be objected to as being a substantial duplicate thereof. Claim 14 is amended to avoid such an objection upon the allowance of Claim 14.

The Office Action objected to Claim 1 because of an informality. Multiple clarifying amendments are made to independent Claim 1 to render this objection moot. Amended Claim 1 provides proper antecedent basis.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 3, 4, 17 to 19, 22 to 24, 29 to 32 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as lacking antecedent basis for various respective claim elements. The amended claims provide antecedent basis for each of the claim elements identified by the Office Action.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 12 to 15, 18 to 23 and 28 to 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Falconer (U.S. Patent No. 6,832,957). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 18 and 36 to clarify certain of the existing claim elements and place these claims and the claims depending therefrom in condition for formal allowance.

Falconer discloses a gaming device including multiple sets of reels. A player places wagers on one or more paylines associated with each of the sets of reels. Each set of reels independently randomly generates an outcome including a plurality of symbols. The gaming device determines if the player is entitled to any awards by checking the symbols associated with each of the paylines wagered on by the player. If the player is entitled to an award, the gaming device provides the player with such an award.

Thus, in Falconer, each set of reels generates its own respective outcome. For example, in one embodiment, a player is provided with an award if a designated symbol occurs once on one set of reels, twice on a second set of reels and three times on a third set of reels. (See column 7, lines 36 to 60). If the additional sets of reels were copies of the first set of reels, all of the sets of reels would generate the same outcome, and this embodiment would not make sense. In another embodiment of Falconer, the

gaming device provides a bonus award if the same combination of symbols appears on a payline in two or more sets of reels. (See column 8, lines 6 to 9). Similarly, this embodiment would not make sense if each of the additional sets of reels were copies of the first set of reels.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a gaming device including at least one processor programmed to operate with at least one display device for a play of the game to: (a) separately and simultaneously display a plurality of reel displays of a set of reels, wherein each of said reel displays includes a copy of said set of reels and is associated with a different one of a plurality of paylines; (b) activate the set of reels to generate a plurality of symbols; (c) display the same plurality of said symbols generated on the set of reels on each of the reel displays based on said symbols generated on said set of reels, wherein each reel display identifies a combination of symbols occurring on a different one of said plurality of paylines; and (d) provide an award to a player based on any winning combinations of symbols occurring on said paylines.

Falconer does not disclose a gaming device including at least one processor programmed to operate with at least one display device to display the same plurality of symbols generated on a set of reels on each of a plurality of reel displays based on the symbols generated on the set of reels. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are patentable over Falconer and are in condition for formal allowance. For the same reasons as those set forth above, Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 18 and 36 and the claims depending therefrom are also in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 17 to 19, 21, 28, 32 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,270,412). Crawford discloses a gaming device including a slot-type game. In Crawford, a player may save symbols from one or more games and use those symbols in a later game to obtain a winning combination of symbols.

Crawford does not disclose a gaming device including at least one processor programmed to operate with at least one display device to display the same plurality of symbols generated on a set of reels on each of a plurality of reel displays based on the symbols generated on the set of reels. The Office Action appears to reason that

because Crawford discloses a plurality of sets of reels (see Fig. 6) and each reel of each set of reels is displayed through its own display window (see Fig. 3 and column 3, lines 22 to 25), it would have been obvious to simultaneously display a same plurality of symbols generated on a set of reels. Applicants respectfully submit that the disclosure of display windows enabling the display of respective reels of a set of reels would not have led one of ordinary skill in the art to configure the gaming device in the manner now claimed.

In one embodiment of Crawford (i.e., the embodiment with multiple sets of reels), a player may save symbols from one or more games and use those symbols in one or more sets of reels in a later game to obtain a winning combination of symbols. (See Column 5, lines 51 to 56). The player places in additional wager to bring more than one set of reels into play, and provide themselves with more opportunities to win (see column 5, line 67). This game would not make sense if each of the sets of reels generated a copy of the result of the first set of reels. The player's incentive to bring additional sets of reels into play is that the different outcomes generated by the additional sets of reels in combination with any saved symbols provide more potential winning combinations. If each of the sets of reels displayed the same outcome, the use of multiple sets of reels would be meaningless, as the player would combine saved symbols with one set of reels, just as they would with additional sets of reels.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 2, 5, 12, 17 to 19, 21, 28, 32 and 36 are patentable over Crawford and are in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 3, 4 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Cole et al. (U.S. 2004/0137978). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 3, 4 and 20 are patentable over the combination of Crawford and Cole and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 6 to 11 and 22 to 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Baerlocher et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,863). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that

dependent Claims 6 to 11 and 22 to 27 are patentable over the combination of Crawford and Baerlocher and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 13 to 15, 29, 30 and 33 to 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Asdale (U.S. 2004/0038724). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 13 to 15, 29, 30 and 33 to 35 are patentable over the combination of Crawford and Asdale and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 16 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Meyer (U.S. 2002/0082075). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 16 and 31 are patentable over the combination of Crawford and Meyer and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 17 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crawford in view of Crawford (U.S. 2003/0017868). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 17 and 32 are patentable over the combination of Crawford and Crawford (US 2003/0017868) and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Kaminkow (U.S. 2004/0043815). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 3 and 4 are patentable over the combination of Crawford and Kaminkow and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Mierau et al. (U.S. 2005/00130733). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claim 7 is patentable over the combination of Falconer and Mierau and stands in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 8, 9, 11, 24, 25 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Baerlocher (US 2004/00130733). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 8, 9, 11, 24, 25 and 27 are patentable over the combination of Falconer and Baerlocher and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 10 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Baerlocher and Mierau. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 10 and 26 are patentable over the combination of Falconer, Baerlocher and Mierau and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 16 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Meyer. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 16 and 31 are patentable over the combination of Falconer and Meyer and stand in condition for formal allowance.

The Office Action rejected Claims 17 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falconer in view of Crawford (U.S. 2003/0017968). Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. In view of the patentability of independent Claims 1 and 18, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 17 and 32 are patentable over the combination of Falconer and Crawford (U.S. 2003/0017968) and stand in condition for formal allowance.

Applicants have made an earnest endeavor to place this application in condition for formal allowance and in the absence of more pertinent art, such action is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Adam H. Masia

Reg. No. 35,602

Customer No. 29159

Date: July 6, 2007